



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

section as M. Braesch concludes. The record says they were "personnes inconnues", and to go beyond that is guess-work.

H. E. BOURNE.

William Pitt and the Great War. By J. HOLLAND ROSE, Litt.D.
(London: G. Bell and Sons. 1911. Pp. xiii, 596.)

IN this volume Mr. Rose concludes his notable biography of the younger Pitt. As indicated in the review of the preceding volume (*AM. HIST. REV.*, XVII. 134) the career of Pitt is logically divided into two distinct periods, in the first of which he is to be judged for his administration of British finances and his efforts for parliamentary reform, while in the second he was plunged by forces beyond his control into the chaos of European politics and wars. The biographical method lends itself much less easily to the second period, for here the author must frequently devote pages to an analysis of general European diplomacy, before he can introduce to the reader's understanding, the activities of his hero. Mr. Rose himself writes that Pitt's "career now depended upon the issue of the gigantic strife", and that "the mighty drama dwarfs the actors". Thus the method of the second volume seems quite different from that of the first—is less simple, less direct, and in some degree less convincing. Mr. Rose shares with other English writers an apparent disdain of the critical bibliography, but to the student of the period it will be an exasperation, that but a page and a half of "chief works" used, is given, consisting of such undifferentiated materials as the *Malmesbury Diaries*, *Dropmore Papers*, "Pitt MSS.", Sorel's *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, and Wraxall's *Memoirs*. Mr. Rose has shown in other writings that he understands perfectly the care with which Malmesbury must be checked for accuracy; that the one great weakness of Sorel's work is its treatment of English diplomacy; that Wraxall was first of all a malicious gossip. Certainly some indication should have been given in the list of the distinction to be drawn as to credibility between such works and the *Dropmore Papers* and the "Pitt MSS." Many other references are cited in foot-notes that do not appear in the initial list, but there also the author does not discriminate as to values. Miles's *Correspondence* appears, in fact, as a citation much more frequently than does Wraxall, though the former is not listed as a "chief work". This criticism, be it understood, is directed against the usefulness of the work, and not against the author's knowledge or discrimination, though occasionally he sins in citing but one indifferent authority for some doubtful point.

Turning to the merit of the work as a study of European conditions, and Pitt's relation to them, Mr. Rose must be congratulated for a distinctly able and readable book. It is true that one does not get much new light on Pitt's own personal characteristics, though the author has searched high and low for every additional scrap of evidence. A brief review cannot present details, but three main points are made again

and again, either directly or indirectly, throughout the volume. The first of these is that Pitt was *not* always and ever "his own master"—with a free hand to direct British policy, and a complete control of his cabinet. Mr. Rose, when treating of foreign policy up to 1797, is very careful, for example, to state that "Pitt and Grenville", or "Grenville and Pitt" reached a determination, and took such and such a step. Pitt is shown indeed as the recognized leader, but not as the dominating master of English policy, whether at home or abroad. Secondly, it is acknowledged that Pitt was not fitted by previous experience to deal successfully with the intriguing diplomacy of the Continental courts, was too trustful of foreign powers in alliance with England, and was frequently deceived. But here, as also in regard to military affairs, Mr. Rose states rightly that Pitt should not be judged incapable because of occasional failures, but rather as a man of superior ability, since, cast unexpectedly into a vortex of war and diplomacy, for which he had no natural gifts, he rose in the end above his limitations, and evolved certain great principles of action that brought England safely through the crisis. And in the third place, with repeated emphasis, the author regrets Pitt's treatment of the movement in England for political reform. Himself earlier an advocate of such reform, he seems to have lost heart in the cause and to have turned in the end to a severe repression of it. The so-called revolutionary movement in England, the author does not consider to have been ever seriously dangerous. Pitt himself was not troubled by its first manifestations, and not until the rupture with France did he begin those acts of repression that have dimmed his fame. The Whig accusation that Pitt secretly stirred revolt, that he might gain parliamentary support by crushing it, Mr. Rose denies, but Pitt's cruelty in repression, the author does not think justified. "So far as I have found, not one life was taken by the people in the course of this agitation. . . . The hero of the year 1794 is not William Pitt, but the British nation. . . . In truth, Pitt had not the gift without which the highest abilities and the most strenuous endeavours will at novel crises be at fault—a sympathetic insight into the needs and aspirations of the people. His analytical powers enabled him to detect the follies of the royalist crusaders; but he lacked those higher powers of synthesis which alone could discern the nascent strength of Democracy." Mr. Rose is in the main, however, eulogistic of Pitt, but the illustrations just given indicate that in this life of his hero he has preserved an unbiased mind. The result is a work superior as an historical study to any that has appeared in English on the career of the younger Pitt.

EPHRAIM D. ADAMS.

Pitt and Napoleon: Essays and Letters. By J. HOLLAND ROSE, Litt.D., Reader in Modern European History, University of Cambridge. (London: G. Bell and Sons; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1912. Pp. vii, 343.)